

from the astounding change in world affairs that began while he was in office: the collapse of the U.S.S.R. and the end of the Cold War. President Reagan spoke frankly and frequently about the bankruptcy—both moral and economic—of the Soviet regime. His words and actions energized dissidents and activists struggling for change and for justice in the face of Communist repression and tyranny. His optimism helped to give them confidence that they were, indeed, on the right side of history.

President Reagan not only recognized the monstrous nature of Communist totalitarianism, but he also understood the horror of a geopolitical reality that made the entire world hostage to the threat of nuclear annihilation. He had the courage to act, to reach out to the Soviet leadership and to craft landmark arms control agreements, including one that, for the first time, eliminated a class of nuclear weapons.

On the domestic front, it was under the leadership of President Reagan that the solvency of the Social Security program was extended through reforms to the existing program. Although modest in their overall scope, those reforms were seen by many as politically risky, and President Reagan provided critical leadership that helped assure both a reluctant Congress and an uncertain public. Today, we should build on the Reagan reforms, and strengthen the existing program, as he did.

Another significant domestic policy challenge that President Reagan tackled was the simplification of our tax code. In the face of special interest pressures, and under the leadership of his Secretary of Treasury, Donald Regan, as well as a bipartisan group of members of the House and Senate, President Reagan was able to push through the last significant reforms to our increasingly complex tax code in 1986.

At the time, I was the Chairman of the Taxation Committee in the Wisconsin State Senate and we were holding a variety of hearings around the State, addressing parallel reforms. These hearings and reforms were driven by President Reagan's proposal. Though far from perfect, that reform effort is another model for action we need to undertake again. And policymakers in Congress and the executive branch would do well to follow President Reagan's example in this matter.

Of course, no review of President Reagan's legacy would be complete without acknowledging his Alzheimer's disease which, sadly, defined the last 10 years of his life as well as the lives of his family. As the author of Wisconsin's Alzheimer's program, I have become all too aware of the heart-breaking tragedy that this dread disease brings to a family.

President Reagan's brave, public acknowledgment of the disease, and the wonderful efforts of his wife Nancy,

have done a great deal to educate the country about this horrible affliction. They have also helped to spur government investment in the research needed to find a cure, and to raise awareness of the need for long-term care services for those suffering from Alzheimer's.

President Ronald Wilson Reagan helped to transform America and the world. He and his achievements will forever be honored and remembered.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, the Capitol today is overflowing with visitors, flags stand at half-staff, and the Nation has collectively stopped this week—all to honor a remarkable man who accomplished remarkable things during a remarkable time.

President Ronald Reagan gave his life to public service and has left a legacy of leadership that will always be remembered.

We remember President Reagan's strong vision for political and economic freedom which was instrumental in the fall of communism and the spread of democracy in Eastern Europe. The world held its breath as America stared communism in the face, but in the end we peacefully won over the respect and cooperation of our enemy. Less than a year after Reagan left office, Mr. Gorbachev stepped down, the Berlin Wall fell and the cold war ended.

I will never forget President Reagan's historic speech on June 12, 1987, in front of the Brandenburg Gate near the Berlin Wall when he called on Mikhail Gorbachev to "Open this gate! Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall."

Today, the United States is working with Russia to replace tyranny and fear in Iraq with peace and stability.

Of President Reagan, Gorbachev said, "A true leader, a man of his word and an optimist, he traveled the journey of his life with dignity and faced courageously the cruel disease that darkened his final years. He has earned a place in history and in people's hearts."

We also remember Dutch, the Great Communicator, the Gipper as a man of great optimism and humor. My kids' history books recall the dates and facts of this time, but they do not convey this Hollywood actor turned President's good-natured spirit or genuine optimism for a better tomorrow. Nor can they express his unyielding dedication and love for our country. However, I believe the outpouring of respect and affection shown by the American public this week says we will forever remember his character and personality.

Finally, we remember a man who never stopped believing, never stopped advocating America's ability to succeed and prosper. He stuck to his convictions and his visions for America, whether popular or not.

Ronald Reagan's initiatives didn't please all Americans and Democrats and Republicans did not always agree on President Reagan's foreign policy or domestic agenda, but he never encouraged or played the biting partisan

games that exist today. Even with those people whom he had genuine ideological differences, President Reagan always showed a level of respect and acknowledged that we are all Americans and we are in this together.

Years ago, President Reagan and Speaker of the House Tip O'Neill used to joke that, "between 9 and 5 we are enemies, but at 5 o'clock let's go have a cocktail together." To truly honor and remember President Reagan—this man of great accomplishment, optimism, and oratory—perhaps we could find ways to work better together for a better tomorrow.

I extend my deepest sympathies to the Reagan family in their time of sorrow, and I hope it is of some comfort that Americans and many others throughout the world mourn by their side.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GEORGE TENET

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, we all learned recently that an outstanding public servant, the Director of Central Intelligence, George Tenet, has decided to step down. I am personally saddened by this announcement because I believe the country has been well served by Mr. Tenet.

George Tenet started his career in public service as part of the Senate family working for the late Republican Senator John Heinz. He served on the professional staff of the Senate Intelligence Committee rising to become the committee staff director for my good friend Senator David Boren.

I was the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Defense Subcommittee during that period. Our committee works closely with the Intelligence Committee in determining the funding for our classified programs. So I believe I can speak with some authority in saying that George was a top-notch staff director. And, I believe his tenure in the Senate prepared him well for the position of Director of Central Intelligence.

I have known every CIA Director since Allen Dulles. I have worked closely with each Director for the past 30 years. All of them have been honorable men, well-meaning and decent public servants, but none was a better Director of Central Intelligence than George Tenet.

Intelligence is a critical part of our national security. Obviously it does not get the public scrutiny that most Government functions receive. To do so would jeopardize the lives of countless agents and analysts who serve this Nation. We limit the number of people

who receive sensitive information to lessen the chance that it will be inadvertently disclosed and harm our national security. As such, much of the good news in intelligence is never brought to light.

When the CIA breaks up a terrorist cell in Albania or Egypt it cannot be disclosed. When critical information is discovered by our intelligence community about weapons trafficking on the high seas, the weapons can be confiscated, but the American people are not told.

Unfortunately, only the operations that fail become public. So our CIA Directors are generally not known for their successes, only for their failures.

It is an historical fact that there has been great temptation to use intelligence operations and analysis to achieve political objectives.

As most of my colleagues know, the Senate established the Select Committee on Intelligence in the mid-1970s to review intelligence activities in response to improprieties which occurred in the 1960s and 1970s. During that period, I was fortunate to serve as the first Chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee.

There have been other unfortunate incidents when individuals in the executive branch have circumvented the law to further their objectives. We all remember the Iran-contra scandal when rogue elements ran an extra legal operation out of the White House.

Some have suggested that intelligence was recently politicized to justify the war on Iraq.

It is my view, and I think history will one day prove that any politicization of intelligence that might have occurred on Iraq did not come from George Tenet.

Those who are charged with oversight of intelligence for the Congress have a difficult task. We must review intelligence activities and practices, but the universe is truly enormous. There are not enough hours of the day for us to know all the details of intelligence. We could never amass enough staff to monitor every action of the intelligence community. Therefore, we need to be able to trust our intelligence leaders.

The Senate could trust George Tenet to tell the truth and be forthright with this institution. Perhaps it was because of his background as a Senate staff member, but George was always eager to inform and consult with the Senate to share important information regardless how sensitive it might have been.

My experience with the CIA has been that many past Directors were reluctant to provide detailed information to the Congress. Perhaps it was the ingrained culture that protects secrets, or perhaps it was the lack of trust between the executive and legislative bodies, but for whatever reason, they didn't want to tell the Congress any more than they had to.

With George it was different. He would take time to explain controver-

sial and highly classified issues in detail. At times he would direct his associates in the community to be more forthright in their responses when he felt they might be holding back.

George Tenet trusted the Congress with the Nation's secrets as partners in national security, not adversaries or impediments.

I know the Director has his critics, but they do not come from the Defense Subcommittee. I think I can speak for my chairman when I tell you we both had the utmost confidence in George Tenet. And, no one in the Senate or the House has spent more years overseeing the intelligence community than Ted and I.

George Tenet is depicted today by some as the Director of Intelligence who failed to stop the tragedy of 9/11 and criticized for the description by author Bob Woodward that the case for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq was a "slam dunk." Both of those miss the point.

George Tenet should be remembered as one of the finest Directors in the history of Central Intelligence. He should be remembered as the most honest and forthright of any CIA Director. He should be thought of as the Director who took an agency from the cold war mentality and started to reshape it for the 21st century. I know he will be remembered by the thousands of CIA employees as a great leader who did his very best to support them and the entire intelligence community.

I will remember him as a tremendous public servant who served honorably, effectively and tirelessly.

Mr. President, someday when the records are declassified and the analysis is completed, historians will likely remember George with great regard. It is my view that he should not have to wait. We should all thank him for his dedication to duty and his service to our country.

ELIMINATION OF THE 30-PATIENT LIMIT FOR GROUP PRACTICES

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, S. 1887, which the Senate adopted yesterday, ensures that all appropriately trained group practice physicians may prescribe and dispense certain recently approved drugs for the treatment of heroin addiction. It addresses the unintended effect of the Drug Addiction and Treatment Act of 2000, DATA, that hinders access to new treatments for thousands of individuals who seek such help.

When Congress passed DATA as Title XXXV of the Children's Health Act of 2000, Public Law 106-310, it allowed for the dispensing and prescribing of Schedule III drugs, like buprenorphine/naloxone, in an office-based setting, for the treatment of heroin addiction. As a result of DATA, access to drug addiction treatment is significantly expanded; patients no longer are restricted to receiving treatment in a large clinic setting, but now may re-

ceive such care from specifically trained physicians in an office-based setting.

DATA limits qualified individual physicians to treating no more than 30 patients at a time. This same 30-patient limit applies to medical groups as to individual physicians. For example, the physician members of the Duke University Medical School faculty practice plan may treat only 30 patients at one time, even though they may have 10 individual physicians trained and willing to treat patients and more than 30 patients would benefit from newly available treatment. The difficulties that have arisen, including the dashed hopes for treatment of many, due to the patient limitation on group practices, are detailed in a May 30 article in the Boston Globe, by Peter DeMarco. I would like to share a few excerpts from that article with my Colleagues, as follows:

When buprenorphine became available as a treatment for OxyContin and heroin addiction 18 months ago, many medical professionals and addicts hailed it as a miracle drug, bringing addicts back from the brink and helping them lead normal lives when all else had failed. But for many addicts, buprenorphine remains one of the hardest drugs to obtain. Approved by the Federal Food and Drug Administration in 2002, buprenorphine is an opiate like heroin or the painkiller OxyContin. Unlike those drugs or methadone, the prescribed drug it's meant to replace, buprenorphine doesn't cloud the minds of patients, allowing them to work or study as if they're not on any drug at all. Nearly all who take buprenorphine, meanwhile, say they lose all physical cravings for street drugs.

But a combination of federal limits on the distribution of buprenorphine, and reluctance on the part of some physicians to offer it to patients has kept thousands of opiate addicts from receiving the drug in Massachusetts and across the country. At the heart of the issue is federal legislation passed in 2000—two years before the drug was approved by the FDA—that restricts individual clinical practices from treating more than 30 patients with buprenorphine at a time.

While many substance-abuse experts say the 30-patient figure is too low for some practices, their main quarrel with the Drug Addiction Treatment Act of 2000 is its failure to differentiate single-physician practices, hospitals, and health care organizations. For example, all the doctors who work for Tufts Health Plan can treat a combined 30 patients—the same total as can be seen by a physician practicing alone.

Boston health officials, along with their counterparts in the State and Federal governments, say the Federal legislation erred on the side of caution, and needs to be changed to allow wider access to buprenorphine.

Boston Medical Center's main practice has 200 or more general internal-medicine doctors, and within that practice, we can only treat 30 people. It's the craziest loophole," said Colleen Labelle, nurse-manager of the hospital's Office-Based Opioid Treatment Program. "We get 20 calls a day from across the state. People are begging, desperate to get treated, who we can't treat."

The Federal Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration has begun an internal process to increase the 30-patient cap. But because any proposed change would be subject to the public-review process, approval could take as long as two years, said